

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the action. Claims 1, 5, 9 and 14 have been amended. Claims 18 and 19 are new. No new matter has been added.

The Office rejects claims 9-11 under 103 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,064,751 to Smithies. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses this rejection for the following reasons and for those set forth in prior responses.

The Smithies reference is directed to a system for capturing and verifying a handwritten signature. In Smithies, a user's signature is captured electronically by a signature capture module 4 and a set of measurements relating to the signature is stored in a signature envelope. The measurements are later compared to a known set of handwritten measurements to verify the identity of the signatory. The verification of a signature is accomplished via a signature verification module 6. In Smithies, "the user signs the document, (e.g., by moving the pen or stylus across the screen)..." Column 4, lines 30-32.

In the present invention, a user is not limited to signing a document by moving the pen or stylus across the screen, e.g, the display member. Rather, the user can utilize a mouse or other input device on any surface to 'sign' or trace his authorization indicia. See for example, page 15 of the original disclosure. This feature is now reflected in claim 9 which has been amended to include that the "movement of the input device is at a location remote from the display device." This feature is not present in the Smithies reference, nor could the Smithies reference operate in this manner as it requires "a combination of a pen/digitizer and display" (col. 7, line 59), wherein "the user signs the document, (e.g., by moving the pen or stylus across the screen) (Column 4, lines 30-32)" Thus, the Smithies reference fails to meet the limitation requiring the "movement of the input device [being] at a location remote from the display device." Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable over Smithies. Since claims 10-11 depend from claim 9, they are also allowable.

The Office further rejects claims 1-8 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smithies in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,751 to Moussa. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the rejection for the following reasons and for the reasons set

Serial No. 09/912,764

forth in the prior responses.

For the reasons set forth above, claims 1 and 5, as amended, are not met by the Smithies reference. Further, the Moussa reference fails to meet the claim language that the “movement of the input device is at a location remote from the display device.” See for example, Figure 1, wherein the writing implement 104 (input device) is moved across the pressure plate 103 (display device). Additionally, claims 1 and 5 have been amended such that the fitting algorithm is “configured to smooth user indicia input for display in the input pad.” This feature is not met by either the Smithies reference or the Moussa reference, alone or in combination. For instance, in Smithies, the “bending” of the signature is subject to certain internal checks, and is not for the purpose of display but rather to accommodate “gradual change” in a user’s signature. Similarly, in Moussa, the “test signature may be preprocessed, so as to normalize it and remove artifacts which are irrelevant to verification.” Abstract. Thus, the fitting algorithm is for purposes of comparison to a template of an originally submitted signature and not “for display” on the input pad. Accordingly, claims 1 and 5 are allowable, and claims 2-4, 6-8, and 12-17 which depend, directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 5 are also allowable.

New claims 18 and 19 are directed to the fitting algorithm. None of the claim limitations of “segmenting the user indicia and identifying control points” as required by claim 18, nor the limitation that the fitting algorithm “utilizes Bezier curves” is met by either reference, alone or in combination.

The Applicant believes that the claims are now in condition for allowance. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejections and pass the claims onto allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 6, 2007



Anna M. Vradenburgh, Reg. No. 39,868
Koppel, Patrick, Heybl & Dawson
555 St. Charles Drive, Suite 107
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
Telephone: (805) 373-0060